arXiv:1704.04844v1 [math.AP] 17 Apr 2017

ANISOTROPIC SINGULARITIES TO SEMI-LINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS IN A MEASURE FRAMEWORK

Huyuan Chen[1]

Department of Mathematics, Jiangxi Normal University,
Nanchang, Jiangxi 330022, PR China

Abstract. The purpose of this article is to study very weak solutions of elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = 2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} + j\delta_0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0), \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $k > 0$, $j \geq 0$, $B_1(0)$ denotes the unit ball centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 2$, $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an odd, nondecreasing and C^1 function, δ_0 is the Dirac mass concentrated at the origin and $\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}$ is defined in the distribution sense that

$$\langle \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}, \zeta \rangle = \frac{\partial \zeta(0)}{\partial x_N}, \qquad \forall \zeta \in C_0^1(B_1(0)).$$

We obtain that problem (1) admits a unique very weak solution $u_{k,j}$ under the integral subcritical assumption

$$\int_1^\infty g(s)s^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}ds < +\infty.$$

Furthermore, we prove that $u_{k,j}$ has anisotropic singularity at the origin and we consider the odd property $u_{k,0}$ and limit of $\{u_{k,0}\}_k$ as $k \to \infty$.

We pose the constraint on nonlienarity $g(u)$ that we only require integrability in the principle value sense, due to the singularities only at the origin. This makes us able to search the very weak solutions in a larger scope of the nonlinearity.

1. Introduction

As early as in 1977, Lieb-Simon in [10] studied the very weak solutions to equation

$$-\Delta u + (u-\lambda)_+^{\frac{3}{2}} = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \delta_{a_i} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \tag{1.1}$$

in the description of the Thomas-Fermi theory of electric field potential determined by the nuclear charge and distribution of electrons in an atom, where $\lambda \geq 0$, $t_+ = \max\{t, 0\}$, $m_i > 0$, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and δ_{a_i} is the Dirac mass at a_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. In fact, the solution of (1.1) turns out to be a classical singular solution of

$$-\Delta u + (u-\lambda)_+^{\frac{3}{2}} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}.$$

[1]chenhuyuan@yeah.net

AMS Subject Classifications: 35R06, 35B40, 35Q60.

Key words: Anisotropic singularity; Very weak solution; Uniqueness.

As a fundamental PDE's model, the isolated singular problem

$$-\Delta u + |u|^{p-1}u = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \{0\} \tag{1.2}$$

has been studied extensively, where Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 3$. Brezis-Véron in [3] showed that problem (1.2) admits no isolated singular solution when $p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}$. A complete classification of the isolated singularities at the origin for (1.2) was given by Véron in [18] when $\frac{N+1}{N-1} \leq p < \frac{N}{N-2}$ as follows:

(i) either $|x|^{\frac{2}{p-1}}u(x)$ converges to a constant which can take only two values $\pm[\frac{2}{p-1}(\frac{2p}{p-1} - N)]^{1/(p-1)}$ as $x \to 0$,

(ii) or $|x|^{N-2}u(x)$ converges to a constant $c_N k$, and the couple $(u,\, k)$ is related to the weak solution of

$$-\Delta u + u^p = k\delta_0 \quad \text{in} \quad (\mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega))',$$

where c_N is the normalized constant of the fundamental solution Γ_N of $-\Delta u = \delta_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, that is,

$$\Gamma_N(x) = \begin{cases} c_N|x|^{2-N} & \text{if} \quad N \geq 3, \\ c_N \log|x| & \text{if} \quad N = 2. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

For $1 < p < \frac{N+1}{N-1}$, the above classification holds under the restriction of nonnegative solutions of (1.2) and all above singular solutions are isotropic. A conjucture states that there is a rich structure of the singularities for (1.2) without the restriction of nonnegativity for $1 < p < \frac{N+1}{N-1}$. Véron in [18] partially answered this conjucture and showed that the anisotropic singular solutions could be constructed by considering the following nonlinear eigenvalue problem on S^{N-1}

$$-\Delta_{S^{N-1}}\omega + |\omega|^{p-1}\omega = \lambda\omega,$$

where S^{N-1} is the sphere of unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Delta_{S^{N-1}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator. Later on, Chen-Matano-Véron in [5] provideds the anisotropic singular solutions of (1.2) by analyzing the corresponding Laplace-Beltrami equations in the sphere. More singularities analysis see the references [12, 16, 17, 20].

In contrast with the absorption nonlinearity, the isolated singular solutions of elliptic problem with source nonlinearity

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = u^p \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \{0\}, \\ u > 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \{0\}, \qquad u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

was classified by Lions in [11], by using Schwartz's Theorem to build that

$$-\Delta u - u^p = \sum_{|a|=0}^{\infty} k_a D^a \delta_0 \quad \text{in} \quad (C_c^\infty(\Omega))' \tag{1.5}$$

and then by choosing suitable test functions in $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ to kill all $D^a\delta_0$ with a multiple index and $|a| \geq 1$, finally building the connections with the weak solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = u^p + k\delta_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ \quad u = 0 \qquad\qquad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Lions in [11] proved that when $p \in (1, \frac{N}{N-2})$ with $N \geq 3$, any solution of (1.4) is a weak solution of (1.6) for some $k \geq 0$, and when $p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}$, the parameter $k = 0$. Essentially, $D^a\delta_0$ with $|a| \geq 1$ is killed in (1.5) because it is anisotropic singular source, that is, this

source makes the solutions anisotropic singular. For instance, the fundamental solution of $-\Delta u = D^a\delta_0$ with $a = (0, \cdots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is

$$P_N(x) = \tilde{c}_N \frac{x_N}{|x|^N}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}, \tag{1.7}$$

where $\tilde{c}_N$ are the normalized constants, see [4]. Obviously, P_N has anisotropic singularities.

Inspired by (1.5), we observe that $D^a\delta_0$ with $|a| \geq 1$ could provide anisotropic source and our motivation in this article is to make use of this kind of sources to construct anisotropic singular solutions for (1.2) and to find the criteria for more general nonlinearity. Let $B_1(0)$ be the unit ball centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 2$, denote by δ_0 the Dirac mass concentrated at the origin, to be convenient, $\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} = D^a\delta_0$ with $a = (0, \cdots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and then

$$\langle \frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}, \zeta \rangle = \frac{\partial \zeta(0)}{\partial x_N}, \qquad \forall\, \zeta \in C_0^1(B_1(0)).$$

So our concern is to study the isolated singular solutions of semilinear elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = 2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} + j\delta_0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0), \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

where parameters $k > 0$ and $j \geq 0$.

Before we state our main results, we introduce the definition of weak solution to (1.8) as follows.

Definition 1.1. *A function $u \in L^1(B_1(0))$ is called a very weak solution of (1.8), if $g(u)$ be integrable in the principle value sense near the origin, $g(u) \in L^1(B_1(0), |x|dx)$ and*

$$\int_{B_1(0)} [u(-\Delta)\xi + g(u)\xi]\, dx = 2k\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N} + j\xi(0), \qquad \forall\, \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)). \tag{1.9}$$

We note that $k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}$ and $j\delta_0$ are both visible in the distributional identity (1.9). When $k = 0$, the definition of very weak solution of (1.8) requires $g(u) \in L^1(B_1(0), \rho dx)$, see the references [19]. Since both sources have the support at the origin, so in this article we pose the constraint for the very weak solution that $g(u)$ is integrable in the principle value sense near the origin means, i.e. $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \int_{B_1(0)\setminus B_\epsilon(0)} g(u)\, dx$ exists, that provides higher possibility for searching the sign-changing singular solutions of (1.8).

Now we are ready to state our first theorem on the existence and asymptotic behavior of very weak solutions to problem (1.8).

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $k > 0$, $j \geq 0$, Γ_N, P_N is given in (1.3), (1.7) respectively, and the nonlinearity $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an odd, nondecreasing and Lipschitz function satisfying*

$$\int_1^\infty g(s)s^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}} ds < +\infty \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$g(s+t) - g(s) \leq c_1 \left[\frac{g(s)}{1+|s|}t + g(t)\right], \quad s \in \mathbb{R},\ t \geq 0 \tag{1.11}$$

for some $c_1 > 0$.

Then (1.8) admits a very weak solution $u_{k,j}$ such that

(i) $u_{k,j} \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0) = \{x = (x', x_N) \in B_1(0) : x_N > 0\}$;

(ii) $u_{k,j}$ has the following singularity at the origin

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{u_{k,j}(te)}{P_N(te)} = 2k \quad \text{for} \quad e = (e_1, \cdots, e_N) \in \partial B_1(0),\ e_N \neq 0 \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{u_{k,j}(te)}{\Gamma_N(te)}=j \quad \text{for} \quad e\in\partial B_1(0),\ e_N=0; \tag{1.13}$$

(iii) $u_{k,j}$ *is a classical solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u+g(u)=0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0)\setminus\{0\},\\ u=0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

In the particular case that $j=0$*, denoting* u_k *the solution* $u_{k,0}$ *of (1.8) with* $j=0$*,* u_k *is* x_N*-odd, that is,*

$$u_k(x',x_N)=-u_k(x',-x_N),\quad \forall (x',x_N)\in B_1(0)\setminus\{0\}.$$

Furthermore, the x_N*-odd very weak solution is unique.*

We note that $g(s)=|s|^{p-1}s$ with $p\in(0,\frac{N}{N-1})$ verifies (1.10) and (1.11). It follows by (1.12) that $|u_{k,j}|^{p-1}u_{k,j}\in L^1(B_1(0))$, but for $p\in[\frac{N}{N-1},\frac{N+1}{N-1})$ and $k>0$, $|u_{k,j}|^{p-1}u_{k,j}\notin L^1(B_1(0))$. We can't able to obtain the uniqueness of the very weak solution to (1.8), due to the failure of application the Kato's inequality, which requires that the nonlinearity term $g(u)\in L^1(B_1(0))$.

For the existence of very weak solutions, the normal method is to approximate the Radon measure by C_0^1 functions and consider the limit of the corresponding classical solutions. When $k>0$, we use a sequence of Dirac measures $\frac{\delta_{te_N}-\delta_{-te_N}}{t}$ to approach the source $\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}$ and in this approximation, the biggest challenge is to find a uniform estimate. To overcome this difficulty, our strategy is to to consider x_N-odd property of solutions when $j=0$ to derive the uniform bound in this approaching process.

We next state the nonexistence of very weak solution of (1.8).

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that* $k>0$*,* $j=0$*,* $g(s)=|s|^{p-1}s$ *with* $p\geq\frac{N+1}{N-1}$*, then there is no* x_N*-odd weak solution for problem (1.8).*

Our strategy here is to make use of x_N-odd property to deduce (1.8) into boundary data problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u+g(u)=0 & \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0),\\ u=k\delta_0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0), \end{cases}$$

in the distributional sense that

$$\int_{B_1^+(0)}u(-\Delta)\xi dx+\int_{B_1^+(0)}g(u)\xi dx=2k\frac{\partial\xi(x_0)}{\partial x_N},\qquad \forall\,\xi\in C_0^{1,1}(B_1^+(0)). \tag{1.15}$$

It is interesting but still open to derive the nonexistence when $j\neq 0$.

Finally, we analyze the limit of the weak solutions $\{u_k\}_k$ as $k\to\infty$. From the monotonicity of u_k in $B_1^+(0)$ and $B_1^-(0)$ respectively, the limit of $\{u_k\}_k$ as $k\to\infty$ exists in $B_1(0)\setminus\{0\}$, denote

$$u_\infty(x)=\lim_{k\to\infty}u_k(x),\qquad \forall\, x\in B_1(0)\setminus\{0\}. \tag{1.16}$$

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that* $k>0$*,* $j=0$*,* $g(s)=|s|^{p-1}s$ *with* $p>1$*,* u_k *is the unique* x_N*-odd very weak solution of (1.8) and* u_∞ *is given by (1.16). Then* u_∞ *is a classical solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u+|u|^{p-1}u=0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0)\setminus\{0\},\\ u=0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{1.17}$$

and satisfies that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} u_\infty(te)t^{\frac{2}{p-1}} = \varphi(e), \qquad \forall e \in \partial B_1(0), \tag{1.18}$$

where $\varphi : \partial B_1(0) \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a continuous* x_N*-odd function such that for unit vector* $e = (e_1, \cdots, e_N)$

$$\varphi(e) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad e_N > 0.$$

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we analyze the x_N-odd property. Section 3 is devoted to study the x_N-odd very weak solution in subcritical case when $j = 0$ and the nonexistence the x_N-odd very weak solution in the subcritical case. In Section 4, we consider the limit of the unique x_N-odd weak solutions u_k of (1.8) with $j = 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Finally, we prove the existence of non x_N-odd very weak solution when $j > 0$ in Section 5.

2. Preliminary

We start this section from the x_N-odd property. Notice that an x_N-odd function w defined in a x_N-symmetric domain B^* satisfies

$$w(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \{(x', 0) \in B^*\}.$$

In what follows, we denote by c_i a generic positive constant.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that* $f \in C^1(\overline{B_1(0)})$ *is an* x_N*-odd function,* $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ *is an odd and nondecreasing function.*

Then

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = f & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

admits a unique classical solution w_f*. Moreover,*

(i) w_f *is* x_N*-odd in* $B_1(0)$*;*

(ii) assume more that $f \geq 0$ *in* $B_1^+(0) = \{x \in B_1(0) : \ x_N > 0\}$ *and* $f \not\equiv 0$ *in* $B_1^+(0)$*, then* $w_f > 0$ *in* $B_1^+(0)$*.*

Proof. Since g is an odd and nondecreasing function, then it is standard to obtain the existence of solution by the method of super and sub solutions.

Uniqueness. Let $w_f, \tilde{w}_f$ be two solutions of (2.1), $w = w_f - \tilde{w}_f$ in $B_1(0)$ and $A_+ = \{x \in B_1(0) : \ w(x) > 0\}$. We claim that $A_+ = \emptyset$. In fact, if $A_+ \neq \emptyset$, we observe that w is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = g(\tilde{w}_f) - g(w_f) \leq 0 & \text{in} \quad A_+, \\ w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial A_+. \end{cases}$$

By applying Maximum Principle, we have that

$$w \leq 0 \qquad \text{in} \quad A_+,$$

which contradicts the definition of A_+. Then $A_+ = \emptyset$. Similarly, $\{x \in B_1(0) : w(x) < 0\}$ is empty. Therefore, $w_f = \tilde{w}_f$ in $B_1(0)$ and the uniqueness holds.

(i) Let $v(x', x_N) = -w_f(x', -x_N)$, and by direct computation, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta v(x) + g(v(x)) &= -\Delta[-w_f(x', -x_N)] + g(-w_f(x', -x_N)) \\ &= \Delta w_f(x', -x_N) - g(w_f(x', -x_N)) \\ &= -f(x', -x_N) = f(x), \end{aligned}$$

then v is a solution of (2.1). It follows from the uniqueness of solution of (2.1) that

$$w_f(x', x_N) = -w_f(x', -x_N), \quad \forall x = (x', x_N) \in B_1(0).$$

(*ii*) We observe that $w_f = 0$ on $\partial B_1^+(0)$ and then w_f is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = f & \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0). \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

We now claim that $w_f \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$. Indeed, if not, we have that $\min_{B_1^+(0)} w_f < 0$. Let $A_- = \{x \in B_1^+(0) : \ w_f(x) < \frac{1}{2}\min_{B_1^+(0)} w_f\}$, then $\psi := w_f + \frac{1}{2}\min_{B_1^+(0)} w_f$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \psi \geq 0 & \text{in} \quad A_-, \\ \psi = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial A_-. \end{cases}$$

By Maximum Principle, we have that

$$w_f(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min_{B_1^+(0)} w_f, \quad x \in A_-,$$

which contradicts the definition of A_-.

We next prove that $w_f > 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$. Problem (2.2) could be seen as

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \phi u = f & \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0), \end{cases}$$

where $\phi(x) = \frac{g(w_f(x))}{w_f(x)}$ if $w_f(x) \neq 0$ and $\phi(x) = g'(0)$ if $w_f(x) = 0$. It follows by $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ that ϕ is continuous and $\phi \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$. Since $f \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, it follows by strong maximum principle that $w_f > 0$ or $w_f \equiv 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, then we exclude $w_f \equiv 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$ by the fact that $f \not\equiv 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$. □

Corollary 2.1. *Assume that $f \in C(\overline{B_1(0)})$ is an x_N-odd function such that $f \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$ and $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is an odd and nondecreasing function. Let w_f be the solution of (2.1) and $\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[f]$ be the unique solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Then $\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[f]$ is x_N-odd and

$$0 \leq w_f \leq \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[f] \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0).$$

Proof. By applying Lemma 2.1 with $g \equiv 0$, we have that $\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[f]$ is x_N-odd and

$$\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[f] \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0).$$

Denote $v = \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[f] - w_f$, then $v = 0$ on $\partial B_1^+(0)$ and $-\Delta v = g(w_f) \geq 0$, by Maximum Principle, we have that $v \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, which ends the proof. □

Corollary 2.2. *Assume that $f \in C(\overline{B_1(0)})$ is an x_N-odd function such that $f \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$ and g_1, $g_2 \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ are odd and nondecreasing functions satisfying*

$$g_1(s) \leq g_2(s), \quad \forall s \geq 0.$$

Let $w_{f,i}$ be the solutions of (2.1) replaced by g by g_i with $i = 1, 2$ respectively.

Then

$$|w_{f,1}(x)| \geq |w_{f,2}(x)|, \qquad \forall x \in B_1(0).$$

Proof. By applying Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.1, we have that $w_{f,1}, w_{f,2}$ are x_N-odd and are nonnegative in $B_1^+(0)$. We denote $w = w_{f,1} - w_{f,2}$, then w satisfies that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = g_2(w_{f,2}) - g_1(w_{f,1}) & \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0), \\ \quad w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0). \end{cases}$$

We first claim that $w \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$. If not, we have that $\min_{B_1^+(0)} w < 0$. Let us define

$$A_- = \left\{ x \in B_1^+(0) : \ w(x) < \frac{1}{2} \min_{B_1^+(0)} w \right\},$$

then $\tilde{w} := w + \frac{1}{2} \min_{B_1^+(0)} w$ satisfies that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \tilde{w} \geq 0 & \text{in} \quad A_-, \\ \quad \tilde{w} = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial A_-. \end{cases}$$

By Maximum Principle, we have that

$$w(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min_{B_1^+(0)} w, \quad \forall x \in A_-,$$

which contradicts the definition of A_-. $\square$

Proposition 2.1. *Let f_1 and f_2 be x_N-odd functions in $C^1_{loc}(\overline{B_1(0)} \setminus \{0\}) \cap L^1(B_1(0), |x|dx)$ satisfying $f_2 \geq f_1 \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f_i & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ \quad u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

admits a unique x_N-odd weak solution u_i with $i = 1, 2$ in the sense that $u_i \in L^1(B_1(0))$,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} u_i(-\Delta)\xi dx = \int_{B_1(0)} \xi f_i dx, \quad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)), \ \xi(0) = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Moreover, u_i is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f_i & \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}, \\ \quad u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$0 \leq u_1(x) \leq u_2(x) \leq \int_{B_1^+(0)} \frac{c_2 f_2(y)|y|}{|y-x|(|y-x| + 2|y|)^{N-2}} dy, \quad \forall x \in B_1^+(0). \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. *Uniqueness.* Let w satisfy that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} w(-\Delta)\xi dx = 0, \tag{2.7}$$

for any $\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$ such that $\xi(0) = 0$. Since $0 \in L^1(B_1(0))$, then the test function could be improved into $C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$ without the restriction that $\xi(0) = 0$. Denote by η_1 the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \eta_1 = \text{sign}(w) & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ \quad \eta_1 = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

Then $\eta_1 \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$ and then

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |w| \ dx = 0.$$

This implies $w = 0$ in $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$.

Existence. Let $f_{i,\epsilon} = f_i \chi_{B_1(0)\setminus B_\epsilon(0)}$, where $i = 1, 2$, $\chi_{B_1(0)\setminus B_\epsilon(0)} = 1$ in $B_1(0) \setminus B_\epsilon(0)$ and $\chi_{B_1(0)\setminus B_\epsilon(0)} = 0$ in $B_\epsilon(0)$, then $f_{i,\epsilon}$ is an x_N-odd function in $L^\infty(B_1(0))$ such that $f_{2,\epsilon} \geq f_{1,\epsilon} \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, then

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f_{i,\epsilon} & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

admits a unique solution $u_{i,\epsilon}$ satisfying

$$\int_{B_1(0)} u_{i,\epsilon}(-\Delta)\xi dx = \int_{B_1(0)} \xi f_{i,\epsilon} dx, \qquad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)),\ \xi(0) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, from Lemma 2.1 with $g \equiv 0$, we have that

$$0 \leq u_{i,\epsilon} \leq u_{i,\epsilon'} \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < \epsilon' \leq \epsilon,$$

$$0 \leq u_{1,\epsilon} \leq u_{2,\epsilon} \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0) \quad \text{for any} \quad \epsilon \geq 0,$$

and for any $x \in B_1^+(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{2,\epsilon}(x) &= \int_{B_1(0)} G_{B_1(0)}(x, y) f_{2,\epsilon}(y) dy \\ &= \int_{B_1^+(0)} [G_{B_1(0)}(x, y) - G_{B_1(0)}(x, \tilde{y})] f_{2,\epsilon}(y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{y} = (y', -y_N)$. We observe that $G_{B_1(0)}(x, y) = \frac{c_N}{|x-y|^{N-2}} - \tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}(x, y)$, where $\tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}(x, y)$ is a harmonic function in $B_1(0)$ with the boundary value $\frac{c_N}{|x-y|^{N-2}}$ for $y \in \partial B_1(0)$. Therefore, for $x, y \in B_1^+$, we have that $\tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}(x, y) - \tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}(x, \tilde{y}) \geq 0$ and then

$$G_{B_1(0)}(x, y) - G_{B_1(0)}(x, \tilde{y}) \leq c_3 \left[\frac{1}{|y - x|^{N-2}} - \frac{1}{|\tilde{y} - x|^{N-2}} \right].$$

Moreover, we see that

$$|\tilde{y} - x| \leq |y - x| + 2y_N \leq |y - x| + 2|y|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \frac{1}{|y - x|^{N-2}} - \frac{1}{|\tilde{y} - x|^{N-2}} &\leq \frac{1}{|y - x|^{N-2}} - \frac{1}{(|y - x| + 2|y|)^{N-2}} \\ &= \frac{(|y - x| + 2|y|)^{N-2} - |y - x|^{N-2}}{|y - x|^{N-2}(|y - x| + 2|y|)^{N-2}} \\ &\leq \frac{c_4 |y|}{|y - x|(|y - x| + 2|y|)^{N-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$u_2(x) \leq c_2 \int_{B_1^+(0)} \frac{|y| f_2(y)}{|y - x|(|y - x| + 2|y|)^{N-2}} dy.$$

Therefore, we obtain a uniform bound for $u_{2,\epsilon}$, together with monotonicity, then passing to the limit as $\epsilon \to 0^+$ in (2.10), we deduces that $u_i := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} u_{i,\epsilon}$ is a weak solution of (2.3) and it follows from standard stability theorem that u_i is a classical solution of (2.5) for $i = 1, 2$. $\square$

By direct extension, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.3. *Let f be an x_N-odd function in $C^1_{loc}(\overline{B_1(0)} \setminus \{0\}) \cap L^1(B_1(0), |x|^i dx)$ with $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $f \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases}$$

admits a unique x_N-odd weak solution u_f with $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \geq 2$ in the sense that $u_f \in L^1(B_1(0), |x|^{i-1}dx)$,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} u(-\Delta)\xi dx = \int_{B_1(0)} \xi f dx,$$

for any $\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$ s. t. $|\xi(x)| \leq c|x|^i$ for any $x \in B_1(0)$ and some $c > 0$. Moreover,

$$u_f(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_1^+(0).$$

and u_f is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.1. *The arguments in Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.3 hold when $B_1(0)$ is replaced by $\mathbb{R}^N$ and the boundary condition is done by*

$$\lim_{|x| \to +\infty} u(x) = 0.$$

In order to study the convergence of weak solutions, we recall the definition and basic properties of the Marcinkiewicz spaces.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a domain and μ be a positive Borel measure in Ω. For $\kappa > 1$, $\kappa' = \kappa/(\kappa - 1)$ and $u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega, d\mu)$, we set*

$$\|u\|_{M^\kappa(\Omega,d\mu)} = \inf\{c \in [0, \infty] : \textstyle\int_E |u| d\mu \leq c \left(\int_E d\mu\right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa'}}, \ \forall E \subset \Omega \text{ Borel set}\}$$

and

$$M^\kappa(\Omega, d\mu) = \{u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega, d\mu) : \|u\|_{M^\kappa(\Omega,d\mu)} < \infty\}. \tag{2.11}$$

$M^\kappa(\Omega, d\mu)$ is called the Marcinkiewicz space with exponent κ or weak L^κ space and $\|.\|_{M^\kappa(\Omega,d\mu)}$ is a quasi-norm. The following property holds.

Proposition 2.2. [1] *Assume that $1 \leq q < \kappa < \infty$ and $u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega, d\mu)$. Then there exists $C(q, \kappa) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_E |u|^q d\mu \leq C(q, \kappa) \|u\|_{M^\kappa(\Omega,d\mu)} \left(\int_E d\mu\right)^{1-q/\kappa},$$

for any Borel set E of Ω.

3. x_N-odd very weak solution with $j = 0$

3.1. **Existence of very weak solution.** In this subsection, we prove the existence and uniqueness of very weak solution to problem (1.8) when $j = 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $k > 0$ $j = 0$, the nonlinearity $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an odd, nondecreasing and Lipchitz continuous function satisfying (1.10).*

Then (1.8) admits a unique x_N-odd very weak solution w_k such that

(i) $w_{k'} \geq w_k \geq 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$ for $k' \geq k > 0$;

(ii) w_k satisfies (1.12);

(iii) w_k is a classical solution of (1.14).

Before proving Theorem 3.1, we need following preliminaries.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $k > 0$, the nonlinearity $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an odd, nondecreasing and Lipchitz continuous function and u is a very weak solution of (1.8), locally bounded in $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$. Then u is a classical solution of (1.14).*

Proof. Since $\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}$, δ_0 have the support in $\{0\}$, so for any open sets O_1, O_2 in $B_1(0)$ such that $\bar{O}_1 \subset O_2 \subset \bar{O}_2 \subset B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$, u is a very weak solution of

$$-\Delta u + g(u) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad O_2, \tag{3.1}$$

where $u \in L^\infty(O_2)$ and $g(u) \in L^\infty(O_2)$. By standard regularity results, we have that u satisfies (3.1) in O_1 in the classical sense. □

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider $\{g_n\}_n$ of C^1, odd, nondecreasing functions defined in $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$g_n \le g_{n+1} \le g \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} g_n(s) = n \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \|g_n - g\|_{L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R})} = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let g_n be defined by (3.2) and*

$$\mu_t = \frac{\delta_{te_N} - \delta_{-te_N}}{t}, \quad t \in (0,1).$$

Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = k\mu_t & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

admits a unique very weak solution $w_{k,n,t}$, which is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = 0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, -te_N\}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $w_{k,n,t}$ is x_N-odd in $B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, -te_N\}$,

$$0 \le w_{k,n+1,t} \le w_{k,n,t} \le \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t] \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0) \setminus \{te_N\}$$

and

$$w_{k+1,n,t} \ge w_{k,n,t} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0) \setminus \{te_N\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. We observe that μ_t is a bounded Radon measure and g_n is bounded, Lipschitz continuous and nondecreasing, then it follows from [19, Theorem 3.7] under the integral subcritical assumption (1.10) replaced $\frac{N}{N-1}$ by $\frac{N}{N-2}$ for $N \ge 3$ and the Kato's inequality, problem (3.3) admits a unique weak solution $w_{k,n,t}$. Moreover, $w_{k,n,t}$ could be approximated by the classical solutions $\{w_{k,n,t,m}\}$ to problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = k\mu_{t,m} & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0), \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$\mu_{t,m}(x) = \frac{\sigma_m(x - te_N) - \sigma_m(x + te_N)}{t}$$

and $\{\sigma_m\}_m$ is a sequence of radially symmetric, nondecreasing smooth functions converging to δ_0 in the distribution sense. Furthermore,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} [w_{k,n,t,m}(-\Delta)\xi + g_n(w_{k,n,t,m})\xi]dx = k\int_{B_1(0)} \mu_{t,m}\xi dx, \quad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)). \tag{3.6}$$

Since $\mu_{t,m}$ is x_N-odd and nonnegative in $B_1^+(0)$, so is $w_{k,n,t,m}$ by Lemma 2.1. We observe that $(k+1)\sigma_m \geq k\sigma_m$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$w_{k+1,n,t,m} \geq w_{k,n,t,m} \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0).$$

Since

$$g_n(s)s \leq g_{n+1}(s)s, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R},$$

then it follows from Corollary 2.2 that

$$w_{k,n,t,m} \leq w_{k,n+1,t,m} \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0). \tag{3.7}$$

From the proof of Theorem 2.9 in [19], we know that

$$\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_{t,m}] \to \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t] \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, -te_N\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{in } L^q(B_1(0)) \quad \text{as } m \to \infty,$$

where $q \in [1, \frac{N}{N-2})$. By regularity results, any compact set K and open set O in $B_1(0)$ such that $K \subset O$, $\bar{O} \cap \{te_N, -te_N\} = \emptyset$, there exist $c_6, c_7 > 0$ independent of m such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{k,n,t,m}\|_{C^2(K)} &\leq c_6 \|k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_{t,m}]\|_{L^\infty(O)} \\ &\leq c_7 k \|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]\|_{L^\infty(O)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, up to some subsequence, there exists a measurable function $\tilde{w}$ such that

$$w_{k,n,t,m} \to \tilde{w} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, -te_N\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{in } L^q(B_1(0)) \quad \text{as } m \to \infty,$$

where $q \in [1, \frac{N}{N-2})$. Then $\tilde{w}$ is x_N-odd, nonnegative in $B_1^+(0)$ and

$$g_n(w_{k,n,t,m}) \to g_n(\tilde{w}) \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, -te_N\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{in } L^1(B_1(0)) \quad \text{as } m \to \infty.$$

Passing to the limit in (3.6) as $m \to \infty$, we deduce that $\tilde{w}$ is a weak solution of (3.3). By the uniqueness of weak solution of (3.3), we obtain that $w_{n,t} = \tilde{w}$. Therefore, $w_{n,t}$ is x_N-odd, nonnegative in $B_1^+(0)$ and it follows from (3.7) and (3.4) that

$$w_{k,n,t} \leq w_{k,n+1,t} \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0)$$

and

$$w_{k+1,n,t} \geq w_{k,n,t} \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0).$$

This ends the proof. □

We next passing to the limit of weak solutions as $t \to 0^+$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let g_n be defined by (3.2). Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = 2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

admits a unique very weak solution $w_{k,n}$. Moreover,
(i) $w_{k,n}$ is x_N-odd for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ in $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$0 \leq w_{k,n+1} \leq w_{k,n} \leq 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}] \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0)$$

and

$$0 \leq w_{k,n} \leq w_{k+1,n} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0);$$

(ii) $w_{k,n}$ is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = 0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.1 that problem (3.3) admits a unique very weak solution $w_{k,n,t}$, that is,

$$\int_{B_1(0)}[w_{k,n,t}(-\Delta)\xi + g_n(w_{k,n,t})]dx = k\frac{\xi(te_N)-\xi(-te_N)}{t}, \quad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)). \tag{3.9}$$

On the one hand, we have that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{\xi(te_N)-\xi(-te_N)}{t} = 2\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N}.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.1, we have that

$$|w_{k,n,t}| \le k|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]| \quad \text{in } B_1(0).$$

By regularity results, for $\sigma \in (0,1)$ and any compact set K and open set O in $B_1(0)$ such that $K \subset O$, $\bar{O} \cap \{te_N : \ t \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})\} = \emptyset$, there exist $c_8, c_9 > 0$ independent of t such that

$$\|w_{k,n,t}\|_{C^{2+\sigma}(K)} \le c_8\|k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]\|_{L^\infty(O)} \le c_9 k\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{L^\infty(O)}.$$

Moreover, by [4, Proposition 3.3], $\{\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]\}$ is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(B_1(0), dx)$ if $N \ge 3$ and is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{2}{1+\sigma}}(B_1(0), dx)$ for any $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ if $N = 2$. Therefore, $\{w_{k,n,t}\}_t$ is relatively compact in $L^p(B_1(0))$ for any $p \in [1, \frac{N}{N-1})$. There exists $w_{k,n} \in L^1(B_1(0))$ such that

$$w_{k,n,t} \to w_{k,n} \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1(0) \quad \text{and in } L^1(B_1(0)),$$

which implies that

$$g_n(w_{k,n,t}) \to g_n(w_{k,n}) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1(0) \quad \text{and in } L^1(B_1(0)) \text{ as } t \to 0^+.$$

Therefore, up to some subsequence, passing to the limit as $t \to 0^+$ in the identity (3.9), it follows that $w_{k,n}$ is a very weak solution of (3.8). Moreover, $w_{k,n}$ is x_N-odd and nonnegative in $B_1^+(0)$.

Uniqueness. Let v_n be a weak solution of (3.8) and then $\varphi_n := w_{k,n} - v_n$ is a very weak solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi_n + g_n(w_{k,n}) - g_n(v_n) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\quad \varphi_n = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

By Kato's inequality [19, Theorem 2.4] (see also [8, 9, 17]),

$$\int_{B_1(0)}|\varphi_n|(-\Delta)\xi + \int_{B_1(0)}[g_n(w_{k,n}) - g(v_n)]\text{sign}(w_{k,n}-v_n)\xi\, dx \le 0$$

Taking $\xi = \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[1]$, we have that

$$\int_{B_1(0)}[g_n(w_{k,n}) - g(v_n)]\text{sign}(w_{k,n}-v_n)\xi\, dx \ge 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_1(0)}|\varphi_n|\, dx = 0,$$

then $\varphi_n = 0$ a.e. in $B_1(0)$. Then the uniqueness is obtained. □

The next estimate plays an important role in $w_{k,n} \to w_k$ in $L^p(B_1(0))$ with $p \in [1, \frac{N+1}{N-1})$.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists $c_{10} > 0$ such that*

$$\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{M^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(B_1(0))} \le c_{10} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{M^{\frac{N+1}{N-1}}(B_1(0),|x|dx)} \le c_{10}. \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) = \frac{\partial G_{B_1(0)}(x,0)}{\partial x_N}$$

and for $x, y \in B_1(0)$, $x \neq y$,

$$G_{B_1(0)}(x,y) = \begin{cases} c_N|x-y|^{2-N} + \tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}(x,y) & \text{if} \quad N \geq 3, \\ -c_N \log|x-y| + \tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}(x,y) & \text{if} \quad N = 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{G}_{B_1(0)}$ is a harmonic function in $B_1(0) \times B_1(0)$. Then

$$\left| \frac{\partial G_{B_1(0)}(x,0)}{\partial x_N} \right| \leq c_{11} \frac{|x_N|}{|x|^N} + c_{12}.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\left| \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}] \right| \leq \frac{c_{13}}{|x|^{N-1}}, \quad \forall x \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Proof of (3.10). Let E be a Borel set of $B_1(0)$ with $|E| > 0$, then there exists $r_1 \in (0,1]$ such that

$$|E| = |B_{r_1}(0)|.$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]| dx &= \int_{E \cap B_{r_1}(0)} \frac{c_{13}}{|x|^{N-1}} dx + \int_{E \setminus B_{r_1}(0)} \frac{c_{13}}{|x|^{N-1}} dx \\ &\leq \int_{B_{r_1}(0)} \frac{c_{13}}{|x|^{N-1}} dx \\ &= c_{14} r_1 = c_{15} \left(\int_E |x| dx \right)^{\frac{1}{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of Marcinkiewicz space, we have that

$$\| \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}] \|_{M^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(B_1(0), dx)} \leq c_{15}.$$

Proof of (3.11). Let E be a Borel set of $B_1(0)$ with $|E| > 0$, then there exists $r_2 \in (0,1]$ such that

$$\int_E |x| dx = \int_{B_{r_2}(0)} |x| dx.$$

Since

$$\int_{B_{r_2}(0)} |x| dx = c_{16} r_2^{N+1},$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]| |x| dx &\leq \int_E \frac{c_{13}}{|x|^{N-1}} |x| dx \\ &\leq c_{17} r_2^2 = c_{18} (\int_E |x| dx)^{\frac{2}{N+1}} \leq c_{19}. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof. □

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $g : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is continuous, nondecreasing and verifies (1.10). Then for $q \geq \frac{N+1}{N-1}$,*

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} g(s) s^{-q} = 0.$$

Proof. Since

$$\int_s^{2s} g(t)t^{-1-k_{\alpha,\beta}}dt \geq g(s)(2s)^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}\int_s^{2s} dt = 2^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(s)s^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}$$

and by (1.7),

$$\lim_{s\to\infty}\int_s^{2s} g(t)t^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}dt = 0,$$

then

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} g(s)s^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}} = 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof Of Theorem 3.1. *Existence.* Let $\{g_n\}$ be a sequence of C^1 nondecreasing functions defined by (3.2). It follows that $\{g_n\}$ is a sequence of odd, bounded and nondecreasing Lipschiz continuous functions.

By Proposition 3.2, problem (3.8) admits a unique x_N-odd weak solution $w_{k,n}$ such that

$$0 \leq w_{k,n} \leq 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}] \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad B_1^+(0) \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\int_{B_1(0)}[w_{k,n}(-\Delta)\xi + g_n(w_{k,n})\xi]dx = 2k\frac{\partial\xi(0)}{\partial x_N}, \quad \forall\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)). \tag{3.13}$$

For $\beta \in (0,1)$, any compact set K and open set O in $B_1(0)$ satisfying $K \subset O$, $0 \notin \bar{O}$, we have that

$$\|w_{k,n}\|_{C^{2,\beta}(K)} \leq c_{20}\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{C^1(O)},$$

where $c_{20} > 0$. Therefore, up to some subsequence, there exists w_k such that

$$\lim_{n\to 0^+} w_{k,n} = w_k \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1(0).$$

Then $\{g_n(w_{k,n})\}$ converges to $g(w_k)$ a.e. in $B_1(0)$. By Lemma 3.2, we have that

$$w_{k,n} \to w_k \text{ in } L^1(B_1(0)) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty,$$

$$\|g_n(w_{k,n})\|_{L^1(B_1(0),|x|dx)} \leq c_{21}\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{L^1(B_1(0),|x|dx)},$$

by Proposition 2.2 and $\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}] \in M^{\frac{N+1}{N-1}}(B_1(0),|x|dx)$, we have that

$$m(\lambda) \leq c_{22}\lambda^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}, \quad \forall\lambda > \lambda_0,$$

where

$$m(\lambda) = \int_{S_\lambda}|x|dx \quad \text{with} \quad S_\lambda = \left\{x \in B_1(0) : \left|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\right| > \lambda\right\}.$$

For any Borel set $E \subset B_1(0)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_E |g_n(w_{k,n})||x|dx &\leq \int_{E\cap S^c_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}} g\left(2k\left|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\right|\right)|x|dx \\ &\quad + \int_{E\cap S_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}} g\left(2k\left|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\right|\right)|x|dx \\ &\leq g(\lambda)\int_E |x|dx + \int_{S_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}} g\left(2k\left|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\right|\right)|x|dx \\ &\leq g(\lambda)\int_E |x|dx + m\left(\frac{\lambda}{2k}\right)g(\lambda) + \int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\infty} m(s)dg(2ks).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\infty} g(2ks)dm(s) = \lim_{T\to\infty}\int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\frac{T}{2k}} g(2ks)dm(s).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}m\left(\frac{\lambda}{2k}\right)g(\lambda) + \int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\frac{T}{2k}} m(s)dg(2ks) &\leq c_{24}g(\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda}{2k}\right)^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}} + c_{24}\int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\frac{T}{2k}} s^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}dg(2ks) \\ &= c_{25}T^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(T) + c_{26}\int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\frac{T}{2k}} s^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $c_{26} = \frac{c_{24}}{\frac{N+1}{N-1}+1}(2k)^{2+\frac{N+1}{N-1}}$. By assumption (1.10) and Lemma 3.3, we have that $T^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(T) \to 0$ as $T \to \infty$, therefore,

$$m\left(\frac{\lambda}{2k}\right)g(\lambda) + \int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\infty} m(s)\ dg(2ks) \leq c_{26}\int_{\frac{\lambda}{k}}^{\infty} s^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(s)ds.$$

Notice that the quantity on the right-hand side tends to 0 when $\lambda \to \infty$. The conclusion follows: for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$c_{26}\int_{\frac{\lambda}{2k}}^{\infty} s^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(s)ds \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

For λ fixed, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_E |x|dx \leq \delta \Longrightarrow g(\lambda)\int_E |x|dx \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

which implies that $\{g_n \circ w_{k,n}\}$ is uniformly integrable in $L^1(B_1(0), |x|dx)$. Then $g_n \circ w_{k,n} \to g \circ w_k$ in $L^1(B_1(0), |x|dx)$ by Vitali convergence theorem, see [7].

Furthermore, for any $\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$, we know that

$$|\xi(x) - \xi(0) - \nabla\xi(0)\cdot x| \leq c_{27}|x|^2, \tag{3.14}$$

and it follows the odd prosperity of $w_{k,n}$, g_n and g, that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} g_n(w_{k,n})\xi(0)\,dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_1(0)} g(w_k)\xi(0)\,dx = 0, \tag{3.15}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{B_1(0)} g_n(w_{k,n})\xi\,dx - \int_{B_1(0)} g(w_k)\xi\,dx\right| \\
&\le \left|\int_{B_1(0)} [g_n(w_{k,n}) - g(w_k)]\nabla\xi(0)\cdot x\,dx\right| + c_{27}\int_{B_1(0)} |g_n(w_{k,n}) - g(w_k)||x|^2\,dx \\
&\le c_{28}\|g_n(w_{k,n}) - g(w_k)\|_{L^1(B_1(0),\,|x|dx)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Then passing to the limit as $n \to +\infty$ in the identity (3.13), it implies that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} [w_k(-\Delta)\xi + g(w_k)\xi]dx = 2k\frac{\partial\xi(0)}{\partial x_N}. \tag{3.16}$$

Thus, w_k is a very weak solution of (1.8). The regularity results follows by Lemma 3.1.

Proof of (i). Since $w_{k,n}$ is x_N-odd in $B_1(0)\setminus\{0\}$ and $w_k = \lim_{n\to+\infty} w_{k,n}$ in $B_1(0)\setminus\{0\}$, then it implies that w_k is x_N-odd in $B_1(0)\setminus\{0\}$. By the fact that $w_{k+1,n} \ge w_{k,n} \ge 0$ in $B_1^+(0)$, it follows that

$$w_{k+1} \ge w_k \ge 0 \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0).$$

Proof of (ii). We observe that

$$0 \le w_{k,n} \le 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}] \quad \text{in } B_1^+(0),$$

then $g_n(w_{k,n}) \le g(2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}])$ for $x \in B_1^+(0)$ and let w_g be the unique solution of (2.3) with $f = g(2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}])$, we have that

$$2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) \ge w_{k,n}(x) \ge 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) - w_g(x). \tag{3.17}$$

Then w_k satisfies (3.17). From Proposition 2.1, it infers that for $x = te$ with $t \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ $e = (e_1, \cdots, e_N) \in \partial B_1(0)$ with $e_N > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
w_g(te) &\le \int_{B_1^+(0)} \left[\frac{|y|}{|y-te|(|y-te|+2|y|)^{N-2}}\right] g\left(2k|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}](y)|\right) dy \\
&\le \int_{B_1^+(0)} \left[\frac{|y|}{|y-te|(|y-te|+2|y|)^{N-2}}\right] g(2c_{13}k|y|^{1-N})dy \\
&:= \int_{B_1^+(0)} A(t,y)dy.
\end{aligned}$$

For $y \in B_{\frac{t}{2}}(te)$, we have that $|y-te| \ge \frac{t}{2}$ and $\frac{t}{2} \le |y| \le \frac{3t}{2}$, then

$$t^{N-1}\int_{B_{\frac{t}{2}}(te)} A(t,y)dy \le c_{30}r^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(2c_{13}kr) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r \to +\infty,$$

where $r = t^{-\frac{1}{N-1}}$.

For $y \in B_{\frac{t}{2}}(0)$, we have that $|y - te| \geq \frac{t}{2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} t^{N-1} \int_{B^+_{\frac{t}{2}}(0)} A(t,y)dy &\leq \int_{B_{\frac{t}{2}}(0)} |y| g(2c_{13}k|y|^{1-N})dy \\ &= c_{32} \int_0^{\frac{t}{2}} g(2c_{13}ks^{1-N}) s^N ds \\ &= c_{32} \int_{(\frac{t}{2})^{-\frac{1}{N-1}}}^{\infty} g(2c_{13}k\tau)\tau^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}} d\tau \\ &\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad t \to 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.10).

For $y \in B_1^+(0) \setminus (B_{\frac{t}{2}}(0) \cup B_{\frac{t}{2}}(te))$, we have that $|y - te| \geq \frac{t}{2}, |y| \geq \frac{t}{2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} t^{N-1} \int_{B_1^+(0)\setminus(B_{\frac{t}{2}}(0)\cup B_{\frac{t}{2}}(te))} A(t,y)dy &\leq c_{33}t \int_{B_1^+(0)\setminus(B_{\frac{t}{2}}(0)\cup B_{\frac{t}{2}}(te))} g(2c_{13}k|y|^{1-N})dy \\ &= c_{33}t \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^1 g(2c_{13}kr^{1-N}) r^{N-1} dr \\ &= c_{34} \frac{t^{N-1} g(2c_{13}kt^{1-N})}{t^{-2}} = c_{35}\tau^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}} g(\tau) \\ &\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \tau \to +\infty \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau = 2c_{13}kt^{1-N}$. Then for any $e = (e_1, \cdots, e_N) \in \partial B_1(0)$ and $e_N \neq 0$, we have that

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} t^{N-1} w_g(te) = 0 \tag{3.18}$$

and

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[g(\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}])](te)t^{N-1} = 0.$$

By (3.17),

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](te)t^{N-1} = e_N,$$

and x_N-odd property of w_k, we derive that for any $e \in \partial B_1(0)$,

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} w_k(te)t^{N-1} = 2ke_N.$$

Finally, we prove the uniqueness. Let u_k, v_k be two x_N-odd solutions of (1.8), from Lemma 3.4, u_k, v_k are two solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = 0 & \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0), \\ u = k\delta_0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0). \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

Form the uniqueness of the very weak solution to (3.19), see [14, Theorem 2.1], we obtain $u_k = v_k$ in $B_1^+(0)$ and combine the x_N-odd property we obtain the uniqueness of the very weak solution of (1.8) with $j = 0$. This ends the proof. □

3.2. **Nonexistence.** This subsection is devoted to obtain the nonexistence of very weak solutions of (1.8) in the supercritical case.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that $k > 0$, the nonlinearity $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is an odd, nondecreasing and Lipchitz continuous function. Let u be an x_N-odd very weak solution of (1.8).*

Then u is a very weak solution of (3.19).

Proof. From Lemma 3.1 and the x_N-odd property, we have that

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$

For any x_N-odd function $\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$, we deduce that

$$\xi = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0) \qquad |\xi(x)| \le c_{36}|x|, \quad x \in B_1(0),$$

where $c_{36} > 0$. Since $g(u) \in L^1(B_1(0), |x|dx)$, then for x_N-odd function $\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$, we have that $g(u)\xi \in L^1(B_1(0))$ and the weak solution u satisfies that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} [u(-\Delta)\xi dx + g(u)\xi]dx = 2k\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N}, \tag{3.20}$$

for x_N-odd function ξ in $C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$. By x_N-odd property, we have that

$$\int_{B_1^+(0)} [u(-\Delta)\xi dx + g(u)\xi]dx = \int_{B_1^-(0)} [u(-\Delta)\xi dx + g(u)\xi]dx,$$

which, combined with (3.20), implies that

$$\int_{B_1^+(0)} [u(-\Delta)\xi dx + g(u)\xi]dx = k\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N}, \qquad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1^+(0)).$$

So we have that u is a weak solution of (3.19). □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. When $g(s) = |s|^{p-1}s$ with $p \ge \frac{N+1}{N-1}$ and $k > 0$, [14, Theorem 3.1] shows that the nonnegative solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0), \\ \qquad\qquad u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1^+(0) \setminus \{0\} \end{cases}$$

has removable singularity at origin, so problem (3.19) has no very weak solution, which contradicts Lemma 3.4. Then (1.8) has no x_N-odd weak solution when $g(s) = |s|^{p-1}s$ with $p \ge \frac{N+1}{N-1}$. □

4. Strongly anisotropic singularity for $p \in (1, \frac{N+1}{N-1})$

In this section, we consider the limit of weak solutions w_k as $k \to \infty$ to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + |u|^{p-1}u = 2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ \qquad\qquad u = 0 \qquad\quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0), \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $p \in (1, \frac{N+1}{N-1})$. By Theorem 1.1, we observe that the mapping $k \mapsto w_k$ is nondecreasing in $B_1^+(0)$, then $\lim_{k\to+\infty} w_k(x)$ exists for any $x \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}$, denoting

$$w_\infty(x) = \lim_{k\to+\infty} w_k(x) \quad \text{for} \ \ x \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}. \tag{4.2}$$

For w_∞, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $p \in (1, \frac{N+1}{N-1})$, then w_∞ is x_N-odd,*

$$0 \le w_\infty(x) \le \lambda_0 |x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}, \quad \forall\, x \in B_1^+(0)$$

for some $\lambda_0 > 0$ and w_∞ is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + |u|^{p-1}u = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}, \\ \qquad\qquad u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. In order to obtain the asymptotic behavior of w_∞ near the origin, we construct the function

$$v_p(x) = |x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}, \qquad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}.$$

For $p \in (1, \frac{N+1}{N-1})$, there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that $\lambda_0 v_p$ is a super solution of (4.3) and $-\lambda_0 v_p$ is a sub solution of (4.3).

It follows by Theorem 1.1 that w_k is a classical solution of (4.3) satisfying (1.12), hence by Comparison Principle, for any k, there exists $r_k \in (0,1)$ small enough such that

$$|w_k| \le \lambda_0 v_p \quad \text{in} \quad B_{r_k}(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$

By Comparison Principle, we have that

$$|w_k| \le \lambda_0 v_p \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Since k is arbitrary, we deduce that

$$|w_\infty| \le \lambda_0 v_p \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Therefore, from standard Stability Theorem, we derive that w_∞ is a classical solution of (4.3). □

We next do a precise bound for w_∞ to prove (1.18).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $p \in (1, \frac{N+1}{N-1})$ and w_∞ be defined by (4.2), then w_∞ satisfies (1.18).*

Proof. *We claim that*

$$\frac{1}{c_{36}} t^{\frac{2}{p-1}} P_N(e) \le w_\infty(te) \le c_{36} t^{\frac{2}{p-1}} P_N(e), \quad \forall t > 0,\ e = (e_1, \cdots, e_N) \in \partial B_1(0), e_N > 0. \tag{4.4}$$

We have that

$$2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) \ge w_k(x) \ge 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) - \varphi_p(x), \quad \forall x \in B_1^+(0), \tag{4.5}$$

where $\varphi_p := k^p \mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}^N}[\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}^N}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]^p] \ge \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[w_k^p]$, and φ_p is a x_N-odd solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \tilde{c}_N^p \dfrac{|x_N|^{p-1} x_N}{|x|^{Np}} & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}, \\ \lim\limits_{|x| \to +\infty} u(x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

Indeed, $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}^N}[\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{R}^N}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]^p]$ is x_N-odd and

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_p(x) &= c_N \tilde{c}_N^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|y_N|^{p-1} y_N}{|x-y|^{N-2} |y|^{Np}} dy \\ &= c_N \tilde{c}_N^p |x|^{(1-N)p+2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|y_N|^{p-1} y_N}{|e_z - y|^{N-2} |y|^{Np}} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $e_z = \frac{z}{|z|}$.

We observe that φ_p satisfies

$$-\Delta u(x) = \tilde{c}_N^p \frac{|x_N|^{p-1} x_N}{|x|^{Np}}, \quad \forall x \in B^+_{\frac{3}{2}}(0) \setminus B^+_{\frac{1}{2}}(0),$$

and then it follows by Hopf's Lemma (see [6]) that

$$\varphi_p(x) \le c_{37} x_N, \quad \forall x \in \partial B_1^+(0).$$

Therefore,

$$\varphi_p(e) \le c_{38} P_N(e), \quad \forall e \in \partial B_1^+(0).$$

Proof of lower bound in (4.4). It follows by (4.5) that

$$w_k(x) \geq c_{40}k|x|^{1-N}P_N(\frac{x}{|x|}) - c_{39}k^p|x|^{(1-N)p+2}P_N(\frac{x}{|x|}), \quad \forall\, x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)\setminus\{0\}.$$

Set $\rho_k = (2^{(N-1)(p-1)-3}\frac{c_{39}}{c_{40}}k^{p-1})^{\frac{1}{(N-1)(p-1)-2}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} c_{39}k^p|x|^{(1-N)p+2} &\leq c_{39}k^p(\frac{\rho_k}{2})^{(1-N)p+2} \\ &\leq \frac{c_{40}}{k}\rho_k^{1-N} \leq \frac{c_{40}}{2}k|x|^{1-N} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$k = c_{41}\rho_k^{1-N-\frac{2}{p-1}} \geq c_{41}|x|^{N-1-\frac{2}{p-1}},$$

where $c_{41} > 0$ independent of k. Thus, for $t \in (\frac{\rho_k}{2}, \rho_k),\ e \in \partial B_1(0),\ e\cdot e_N > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_k(te) &\geq [c_{40}kt^{1-N} - c_{39}k^pt^{(1-N)p+2}]P_N(e) \\ &\geq \frac{c_{40}}{2}kt^{1-N}P_N(e) \\ &\geq \frac{c_{40}c_{41}}{2}t^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}P_N(e). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can choose a sequence $\{k_n\} \subset [1,\infty)$ such that

$$\rho_{k_{n+1}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho_{k_n}$$

and for any $x \in B^+_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)\setminus\{0\}$, there exists k_n such that $x \in B^+_{\rho_k}(0)\setminus B^+_{\frac{\rho_k}{2}}(0)$ and

$$w_{k_n}(x) \geq \frac{c_{40}c_{41}}{2}|x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}P_N(\frac{x}{|x|}).$$

Together with $w_{k_{n+1}} \geq w_{k_n}$ in $B_1^+(0)$, we have that

$$w_\infty(x) \geq \frac{c_{40}c_{41}}{2}|x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}P_N(\frac{x}{|x|}), \quad \forall\, x \in B_1^+(0).$$

Proof of the upper bound in (4.4). Let $\bar{w}_p = |x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}-1}x_N$, then

$$-\Delta\bar{w}_p = (\frac{2}{p-1}+1)(\frac{2}{p-1}+1-N)|x|^{-\frac{2}{p-1}-3}x_N,$$

where $(\frac{2}{p-1}+1)(\frac{2}{p-1}+1-N) > 0$ for $p < \frac{N+1}{N-1}$. By Comparison Principle, there exists $t_0 > 0$ independent of k such that

$$u_k \leq t_0\bar{w}_p \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0),$$

which implies that

$$w_\infty \leq t_0\bar{w}_p \quad \text{in} \ \ B_1^+(0).$$

Proof of (1.18). We observe there exists $t_{00} \in (0, t_0)$ such that

$$-\Delta t_{00}\bar{w}_p + (t_{00}\bar{w}_p)^p \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \ \ \mathbb{R}^N_+.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_p + u_p^p = 0 & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N_+, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{R}^N_+\setminus\{0\} \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution u_p and by scaling property, we have that

$$u_p(te) = t^{-\frac{2}{p-1}}u_p(e), \quad te \in \mathbb{R}^N_+.$$

By Comparison Principle, we have that

$$u_p(te) - \max u_p(e) \le u_\infty(te) \le u_p(te), \quad te \in B_1^+(0),$$

which implies (1.18) with $\varphi(e) = u_p(e)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. From Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.1, one has that u_∞ is a classical solution of (1.17) satisfying (1.18). □

5. Non x_N-odd solutions

5.1. **Existence.** Under the assumptions on g in Theorem 1.1, it shows from [19] that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g(u) = j\delta_0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

admits a unique weak solution, denoting by $u_{0,j}$. In the approaching the weak solution of problem (1.8) with $j > 0$, a barrier will be constructed by $u_{0,j}$ and u_k, where u_k is the unique x_N-odd weak solution of (1.8) with $j = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 with $j > 0$. *Step 1.* We observe that g_n is bounded, Lipschitz continuous and nondecreasing, where g_n is defined by (3.2), then it follows from [19, Theorem 3.7] and the Kato's inequality that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = k\mu_t + j\delta_0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0) \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

admits a unique weak solution $v_{k,j,n,t}$, which is a classical solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = 0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, 0, -te_N\}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $v_{k,j,n,t}$ could be approximated by the classical solutions $\{v_{n,t,m}\}$ to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = k\mu_{t,m} + j\sigma_m & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mu_{t,m}(x) = \frac{\sigma_m(x - te_N) - \sigma_m(x + te_N)}{t}$$

and $\{\sigma_m\}$ is a sequence of radially symmetric, nondecreasing smooth functions converging to δ_0 in the distribution sense. Furthermore,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} [v_{n,t,m}(-\Delta)\xi + g_n(v_{n,t,m})\xi]\, dx = \int_{B_1(0)} [k\mu_{t,m} + j\sigma_m]\xi dx, \quad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)). \tag{5.3}$$

Since $k\mu_{t,m} + j\sigma_m \ge k\mu_{t,m}$, it implies by Comparison Prinsiple that

$$w_{k,n,t,m} \le v_{n,t,m} \le w_{k,n,t,m} + v_{j,m} \quad \text{in } B_1(0), \tag{5.4}$$

where $w_{k,n,t,m}$ is the weak solution of (3.5) and $v_{j,n,m}$ is the unique solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = j\sigma_m & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $v_{k,j,n,t}$ satisfies

$$w_{k,n,t} \le v_{k,j,n,t} \le w_{k,n,t} + jv_{j,m} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{te_N, 0, -te_N\}$$

and

$$v_{k',j',n,t} \ge v_{k,j,n,t} \quad \text{in} \quad B_1^+(0) \setminus \{te_N\} \quad \text{for} \ \ k' \ge k, \ j' \ge j. \tag{5.5}$$

Step 2. From Step 1, problem (5.2) admits a unique weak solution $v_{k,j,n,t}$, that is,

$$\int_{B_1(0)}[w_{k,n,t}(-\Delta)\xi + g_n(w_{k,n,t})\xi]\,dx = \frac{\xi(te_N)-\xi(-te_N)}{t} + j\xi(0), \quad \forall \xi \in C_0^2(B_1(0)). \tag{5.6}$$

On the one hand, by Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{\xi(te_N)-\xi(-te_N)}{t} = 2\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N}.$$

On the other hand, by the fact that

$$|w_{k,n,t}| \le k|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]| \quad \text{in } B_1(0),$$

we have that

$$|v_{k,j,n,t}| \le k|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]| + j|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]| \quad \text{in } B_1(0),$$

By interior regularity results, see [15], for $\sigma \in (0,1)$ and any compact set K and open set O in $B_1(0)$ such that $K \subset O$, $\bar{O}\cap\{te_N :\ t \in (-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})\} = \emptyset$, there exist $c_{43}, c_{44} > 0$ independent of t such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_{k,j,n,t}\|_{C^{2+\sigma}(K)} &\le c_{43}[\|k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]\|_{L^\infty(O)} + \|j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]\|_{L^\infty(O)}]\\ &\le c_{44}[k\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{L^\infty(O)} + \|j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]\|_{L^\infty(O)}].\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by [4, Lemma 3.6] $\{\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\mu_t]\}$ is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(B_1(0),dx)$ if $N \ge 3$ and in $M^{\frac{2}{1+\sigma}}(B_1(0),dx)$ for any $\sigma \in (0,\frac{1}{2})$ if $N = 2$, $\{\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]\}$ is uniformly bounded in $M^{\frac{N}{N-2}}(B_1(0))$ if $N \ge 3$ and $\{\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]\}$, is uniformly bounded in $M^q(B_1(0),dx)$ for any $q > 0$. Therefore, $\{v_{k,j,n,t}\}_t$ is relatively compact in $L^p(B_1(0))$ for any $p \in [1,\frac{N}{N-1})$. Then there exists $v_{k,j,n} \in L^1(B_1(0))$ such that

$$v_{k,j,n,t} \to v_{k,j,n} \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1(0) \quad \text{and in } L^1(B_1(0)),$$

which implies that

$$g_n(v_{k,j,n,t}) \to g_n(v_{k,j,n}) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1(0) \quad \text{and in } L^1(B_1(0)).$$

Therefore, up to some subsequence, passing to the limit as $t \to 0^+$ in the identity (5.3), it infers that $v_{k,j,n}$ is the unique very weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(u) = 2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} + j\delta_0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0),\\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0).\end{cases}$$

Here the uniqueness follows by the Kato's inequality. It follows by (5.4), (3.12) and x_N-odd property of $w_{k,n}$ that

$$w_{k,n} \le v_{k,j,n} \le w_{k,n} + j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0] \quad \text{in } B_1(0), \tag{5.7}$$

where $w_{k,n}$ is the unique x_N-odd solution of (3.8). From the proof of Theorem 3.1, we known that for any $\xi \in C_0^{1.1}(B_1(0))$,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} g_n(w_{k,n})\xi\,dx \to \int_{B_1(0)} g(w_k)\xi\,dx \quad \text{as} \quad n \to +\infty.$$

Step 3. It follows by (5.7) that

$$\int_{B_1(0)}[v_{k,j,n}(-\Delta)\xi + g_n(v_{k,j,n})\xi]dx = 2k\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N} + j\xi(0), \quad \forall \xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0)). \tag{5.8}$$

For $\beta \in (0,1)$, any compact set K and open set O in $B_1(0)$ satisfying $K \subset O$, $0 \notin \bar{O}$, we have that

$$\|v_{k,j,n}\|_{C^{2,\beta}(K)} \le c_{45}[\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}]\|_{C^1(O)} + \|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]\|_{C^1(O)}].$$

Therefore, up to some subsequence, there exists $v_{k,j}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} v_{k,j,n} = v_{k,j} \quad \text{a.e. in } B_1(0).$$

Then $\{g_n(v_{k,j,n})\}$ converges to $g(v_{k,j})$ a.e. in $B_1(0)$.

We observe that $\tilde{v}_n := v_{k,j,n} - w_{k,n}$ is the very weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + g_n(w_{k,n}+u) - g_n(w_{k,n}) = j\delta_0 & \text{in} \quad B_1(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial B_1(0). \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

Note that $0 \le \tilde{v}_n \le j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]$ and by (1.11), it follows that

$$0 \le g_n(w_{k,n}+\tilde{v}_n) - g_n(w_{k,n}) \le c_1 \left[\frac{g(w_{k,n})}{1+|w_{k,n}|}\tilde{v}_n + g_n(\tilde{v}_n)\right].$$

Thus, $\{g_n(w_{k,n}+\tilde{v}_n) - g_n(w_{k,n})\}$ converges to $g(w_k+\tilde{v}) - g(w_k)$ a.e. in $B_1(0)$, where $\tilde{v} = v_{k,j} - w_k$.

Let $\tilde{g}_n(s) = g_n(w_{k,n}+s) - g_n(w_k)$, we see that $\tilde{g}_n(0) = 0$ and function $\tilde{g}_n$ is nondecreasing and verifies (1.10). Then it follows by Theorem 3.7 in [19] that

$$\|\tilde{g}_n(\tilde{v}_n)\|_{L^1(B_1(0))} \le c_{46}\|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0]\|_{L^1(B_1(0)dx)}$$

and

$$\tilde{v}_n \le j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0].$$

Thus, it follows by (1.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_n(\tilde{v}_n(x)) &\le c_1 g(j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0](x)) + c_1 \frac{g(2k|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}]|(x))}{1+2k|\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial\delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x)|} j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0](x) \\ &\le c_1 g(c_{45}|x|^{2-N}) + c_{46} g(c_{45}|x|^{1-N})|x|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $S_\lambda = \{x \in B_1(0) : |x| > \lambda^{-1}\}$, then

$$\tilde{m}(\lambda) = \int_{S_\lambda} dx = c_{47}\lambda^{-N}, \quad \forall \lambda > \lambda_0.$$

For any Borel set $E \subset B_1(0)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |\tilde{g}_n(\tilde{v}_n)|dx \le\ & c_1 \int_{E\cap S_\lambda^c} g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-2})dx + c_1 \int_{E\cap S_\lambda} g(c_{45}|x|^{2-N})dx \\ & + c_{46}\int_{E\cap S_\lambda^c} g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-1})\lambda^{-1}dx + c_{46}\int_{E\cap S_\lambda} g(c_{45}|x|^{1-N})|x|dx \\ \le\ & c_1 g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-2})|E| + c_1 m(\lambda) g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-2}) + c_1 \int_\lambda^\infty m(s)dg(c_{45}s^{N-2}) \\ & + c_{46} g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-1})\lambda^{-1}|E| + c_{46} m(\lambda) g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-1})\lambda^{-1} \\ & + c_{46}\int_\lambda^\infty m(s)d(g(c_{45}s^{N-1})s^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since the critical index in (1.10) is $\frac{N+1}{N-1}$, we have that

$$\int_\lambda^\infty g(c_{45}s^{N-2})dm(s) = \lim_{T\to\infty}\int_\lambda^T g(js)dm(s).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&m(\lambda)g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-2}) + \int_\lambda^T m(s)dg(c_{45}s^{N-2}) \\
&= c_{47}T^{-N}g(c_{45}T^{N-2}) + c_{48}\int_\lambda^T s^{-1-N}g(c_{45}s^{N-2})ds \\
&= c_{47}(T^{N-2})^{-\frac{N}{N-2}}g(c_{45}T^{N-2}) + c_{49}\int_{(c_{45}\lambda)^{1/(N-2)}}^{(c_{45}T)^{1/(N-2)}} t^{-1-\frac{N}{N-2}}g(t)dt
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&m(\lambda)g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-1})\lambda^{-1} + \int_\lambda^\infty m(s)d(g(c_{45}s^{N-1})s^{-1}) \\
&= c_{50}T^{-N-1}g(c_{45}T^{N-1}) + c_{50}\int_\lambda^T s^{-2-N}g(c_{45}s^{N-1})ds \\
&= c_{50}(T^{N-1})^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(c_{45}T^{N-1}) + c_{51}\int_{(c_{45}\lambda)^{1/(N-1)}}^{(c_{45}T)^{1/(N-1)}} t^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(t)dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_{47}(T^{N-2})^{-\frac{N}{N-2}}g(c_{45}T^{N-2}) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad T \to \infty$$

and

$$c_{50}(T^{N-1})^{-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(c_{45}T^{N-1}) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad T \to \infty$$

by the assumption (1.10) and Lemma 3.3.

Therefore,

$$c_1 m(\lambda)g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-2}) + c_1\int_\lambda^\infty m(s)dg(c_{45}s^{N-2}) \le c_{49}\int_{(c_{45}\lambda)^{1/(N-2)}}^{(c_{45}T)^{1/(N-2)}} t^{-1-\frac{N}{N-2}}g(t)dt$$

and

$$c_{46}m(\lambda)g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-1})\lambda^{-1} + c_{46}\int_\lambda^\infty m(s)d(g(c_{45}s^{N-1})s^{-1}) \le c_{51}\int_{(c_{45}\lambda)^{1/(N-1)}}^{(c_{45}T)^{1/(N-1)}} t^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(t)dt.$$

Notice that the quantities on the right-hand side tends to 0 when $\lambda \to \infty$. The conclusion follows: for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$c_{49}\int_{(c_{45}\lambda)^{1/(N-2)}}^{(c_{45}T)^{1/(N-2)}} t^{-1-\frac{N}{N-2}}g(t)dt \le \frac{\epsilon}{6}$$

and

$$c_{51}\int_{(c_{45}\lambda)^{1/(N-1)}}^{(c_{45}T)^{1/(N-1)}} t^{-1-\frac{N+1}{N-1}}g(t)dt \le \frac{\epsilon}{6}.$$

For λ fixed, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\int_E dx \le \delta \Longrightarrow c_1 g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-2})|E| \le \frac{\epsilon}{6} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{46}g(c_{45}\lambda^{N-1})\lambda^{-1}|E| \le \frac{\epsilon}{6},$$

which implies that $\{\tilde{g}_n \circ \tilde{v}_n\}$ is uniformly integrable in $L^1(B_1(0))$. Then

$$\tilde{g}_n \circ \tilde{v}_n \to g(w_k + \tilde{v}) - g(w_k) \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(B_1(0))$$

by Vitali convergence theorem.

Then passing to the limit as $n \to +\infty$ in the identity (3.13), it implies that for any $\xi \in C_0^{1,1}(B_1(0))$,

$$\int_{B_1(0)} [w_k(-\Delta)\xi + g(w_k)\xi]dx = 2k\frac{\partial \xi(0)}{\partial x_N} + j\xi(0).$$

Thus, $v_{k,j}$ is a very weak solution of (1.8). The regularity results follows by Lemma 3.1.

Proof of (ii). It follows from (1.11) and (5.7) that

$$v_{k,j,n}(x) \le 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) + j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0](x)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_{k,j,n}(x) &\ge 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) + j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0](x) - \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[g_n(\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N} + j\delta_0])](x) \\ &\ge 2k\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](x) + j\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0](x) - c_1 w_g(x) - c_1\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[g(\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0])](x), \end{aligned}$$

where w_g is the unique solution of (2.3) and

$$\lim_{|x|\to 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0](x)}{\Gamma_N(x)} = 1.$$

We see that for any $e = (e_1, \cdots, e_N) \in \partial B_1(0)$ with $e_N \neq 0$,

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[g(\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\delta_0])](te)t^{N-1} = 0,$$

which, together with (3.18), implies that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} v_{k,j}(te)t^{N-1} = 0.$$

Then

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[g(\mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[2k\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}])](te)t^{N-1} = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \mathbb{G}_{B_1(0)}[\frac{\partial \delta_0}{\partial x_N}](te)t^{N-1} = e_N$$

and by x_N-odd property of w_k, we derive that

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} w_k(te)t^{N-1} = 2ke_N.$$

This ends the proof. □

Acknowledgements: H. Chen is supported by NSFC, No: 11401270, 11661045 and by the Jiangxi Provincial Natural Science Foundation, No: 20161ACB20007 and the Project-sponsored by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

References

[1] Ph. Bénilan, H. Brezis and M. Crandall, A semilinear elliptic equation in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. 2* (1975), 523-555.

[2] Ph. Bénilan and H. Brezis, Nonlinear problems related to the Thomas-Fermi equation, *J. Evolution Eq. 3*(2003), 673-770.

[3] H. Brezis and L. Véron, Removable singularities for some nonlinear elliptic equations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 75* (1980), 1-6.

[4] H. Chen, W. Wang and J. Wang, Anisotropic singularity of solutions to elliptic equations in a measure framework, *Elec. J. Diff. Eq., 2015,* (2015), 1-12.

[5] X. Chen, H. Matano and L. Véron, Anisotropic singularities of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$, *J. Funct. Anal. 83* (1989), 50-97.

[6] L. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, *American Mathematical Society*, 2000.
[7] G. Folland, Real analysis, *Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York)*, 1999.
[8] K. Kato, Schrödinger operators with singular potentials, *Israel J. Math 13*, (1972) 135-148.
[9] E. Lieb and M. Loss, Analysis, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics 14*, 2001.
[10] E. Lieb and B. Simon, The Thomas-Fermi theory of atoms, molecules and solids, *Advances in Math. 23* (1977), 22-116.
[11] P. Lions, Isolated singularities in semilinear problems, *J. Diff. Eq. 38(3)*, 441-450 (1980).
[12] V. Liskevich amd I. Skrypnik, Isolated singularities of solutions to quasi-linear elliptic equations with absorption, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.338*, 536-544 (2008).
[13] M. Ghergu, V, Liskevich and Z. Sobol, Singular solutions for second-order non-divergence type elliptic inequalities in punctured balls, *J. d'Anal. Math. 123*, 251-279 (2014).
[14] A. Gmira and L. Véron, Boundary singularities of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations, *Duke Math. J. 64* (1991), 271-324.
[15] Q. Han and F. Lin, Elliptic partial differential equations, *American Mathematical Soc. vol 1,* 2011.
[16] Y. Naito and T. Sato, Positive solutions for semilinear elliptic equations with singular forcing terms, *J. Diff. Eq. 235*, 439-483 (2007).
[17] M. Reed and B. Simon, Methods of modern mathematical physics: Functional analysis, *Gulf Professional Publishing 1,* 1980.
[18] L. Véron, Singular solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations, *Nonlinear Anal. T. M. & A. 5,* 225-242 (1981).
[19] L. Véron, Elliptic equations involving measures, stationary partial differential equations, *Vol. I, 593-712, Handb. Differ. Eq., North-Holland, Amsterdam* 2004.
[20] L. Véron, Singularities of Solutions of Second-Order Quasilinear Equations, *Chapman and Hall CRC* (1996).
[21] A. Ponce, Elliptic PDEs, measures and capacities, *European Mathematical Society*, (2016).